

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 4, 2006. Claims 19 to 24 are in the application, with Claim 25 having been canceled. Claims 19, 23 and 24 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, the term "a capacity of a software" has been amended to make it even clearer that it is referring to whether or not a web browser is included. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 19 to 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,959,318 (Tso) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,556,217 (Makipaa). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns accessing documents by a user terminal. According to the invention, characteristics related to a user terminal are received, and an order to adapting documents for outputting the documents is determined based on a frequency of access to the documents. The documents are then adapted for output, before receiving a request for access to the documents, in the determined order in accordance with the characteristics of the user terminal. Then, when a request for access to a document is received, the adapted document is read out and sent to the user terminal requesting access to the document. As a result, the documents stored on the server can be properly adapted for output to the user terminal before an access request is received so that a more efficient document providing operation can be obtained.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a

server for providing a document via a network, comprising receiving means for receiving characteristics related to a user terminal, determining means for determining an order for adapting documents for outputting the documents according to a frequency of access to the documents, adapting means for adapting for output, in accordance with the characteristics related to the user terminal, the documents in the determined order before receiving a request for access to a document, reading means for reading out an adapted document upon reception of a request for access to the document, and sending means for sending the document read out to the user terminal.

Claims 23 and 24 are method and computer program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 19.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 19, 23 and 24, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of determining an order for adapting documents for outputting the documents according to a frequency of access to the documents, and adapting for output, in accordance with received characteristics related to a user terminal, the documents in the determined order before receiving a request for access to a document.

Tso is merely seen to disclose communication between a client and a server is disconnected if the priority is considered to be low based on the characteristics of the communication. Further Tso discloses that a URL list is created from a requested Web page in order to preliminarily call up a URL for a proxy server. The list of URL's is created based on a frequency of access to the URLs. However, Tso fails to disclose or suggest determining an order for adapting documents for outputting the documents according to a frequency of access to the documents, and adapting for output, in

accordance with received characteristics related to a user terminal, the documents in the determined order before receiving a request for access to a document.

Makipaa is merely seen to disclose obtaining characteristics of a user terminal from a database based on the model of the user terminal. Thus, although Makipaa may involve characteristics of a user terminal, there simply is no suggestion in Makipaa of determining an order for adapting documents for outputting the documents based on a frequency of access to the documents, or that the documents are then adapted in the determined order based on the characteristics of the user terminal before receiving a request for access to a document. In this regard, Makipaa describes a system and method for content adaptation and pagination based on client terminal capacities. The system has a pagination and terminal adaptation module which will calculate the space needed by an element to be displayed on a user terminal. As described with reference to figures 1 and 3, the method identifies a user terminal type and screen size upon logon of the user, and then extracts corresponding layout and typographical settings from a database in order to perform content adaptation. As explained with respect to figure 3, the content adaptation is always performed after the content request by the client is received. Thus, any permissible combination of Tso and Makipaa would not have resulted in the features of Claims 19, 23 and 24.

In light of the deficiencies of Tso and Makipaa as discussed above, Applicants submit that independent Claims 19, 23 and 24, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'E. Kmett', is written over a horizontal line.

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 117629v1